AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Please replace FIGS. 1 and 2 with the attached Replacement Sheets.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets

REMARKS

This Amendment, submitted in response to the Office Action dated October 15, 2007, is believed to be fully responsive to each point of rejection raised therein. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration on the merits is respectfully requested.

I.   Summary of Non-Final Office Action

Claims 1-9 are all the claims pending in the application.

The drawings (Figs. 1 and 2) and the specification (Abstract) are objected to under MPEP § 608.02(g) and/or 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a).

Claim 1 is objected to.

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Ma et al. (USP 4,998,111; hereafter "Ma") in view of any one of Krasner (USP 5,663,734), Krasner et al. (USP 6,185,427), and King et al (USP 6,313,787).

II.   Analysis of Objections

In this Amendment, Applicant amends Figs. 1 and 2 to comply with the requirements of MPEP § 608.02(g) and/or 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) as indicated by the Examiner. Applicant also amends the specification in relevant parts as the drawings are amended. Claim 1 is amended to correct the abbreviation RNSS. No new matter is added.

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objections.

III.   Analysis of Claim Rejection

In this Amendment, Applicant amends claim 1 to more clearly define the subject matter claimed therein. The added elements in the claim as amended are fully supported in the first to fifth paragraphs of page 10, Fig. 2 and the last paragraph of page 11.

Applicant respectfully submits that the claimed method should be allowable at least due to the amended aspect.

The claim as amended is characterized in that a first correlation function is applied to each of the corrected duplicates before summing up the result, while Ma discloses that the Fast Fourier transform (assuming this corresponds to the first correlation function) is applied to a single signal in the FFT 28 (comprising a total of 2048 elements) after the reference codes are

combined into the single signal (col. 3, lines 36-43 and col. 4, lines 61-65). In other words, Ma applies the Fourier transform at a different time compared to the claimed method.

Note, here, that the first correlation function is exemplified by but not limited to a Fourier transform and the equation as shown in the last paragraph of page 11 of the specification according to the same part of the specification.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Ma does not disclose the above aspect of claim 1 and corresponding apparatus claims 8 and 9, and the deficiency of Ma is not cured by the other references.

Applicant also submits that claims 2-7 should be allowable at least due to their dependencies as well as for their additionally recited elements.

Without regard to its dependency, however, claim 4 should be patentable because Ma does not disclose that, in identifying a satellite, the highest peak among the correlation peaks of the inverse Fast Fourier transform function is first identified. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this aspect of the claim as amended.

IV.   Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC   Seunghee Park
Telephone: (202) 293-7060   Registration No. 60,719
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: March 25, 2008

9